



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mr. Reeve states that the Border and Slave States furnished over 350,000 white soldiers to the Union, and nearly 100,000 blacks.

The truth is, and the record shows, that these States furnished a little over 350,000 *men*, while the colored troops not credited to the States numbered 93,441, and the total of colored troops was 186,097, the difference of 92,656 being credited upon the quotas of the several States furnishing them, and, consequently all, or nearly all, being included in the 350,000 men credited to the Border States.

Yet Mr. Reeve, by his peculiar process of arithmetic, calculates the percentage that this 350,000 soldiers—over one-fourth negroes—bears to the *white males* of military age in the Border States, and compares it with similar estimates from the Northern States, in which the colored factor is missing entirely.

Having arrived at these remarkable conclusions, Mr. Reeve bases upon them an argument, the gist of which is that without the assistance of the loyal men of the South the government could not have suppressed the rebellion. This is, perhaps, true; for the services of the Union men of the Border States will never be fully known, and cannot be too highly appreciated.

But it is also true that if the Union sentiment in the North had been as strong as was the secession sentiment in the States of the Confederacy, it would not have taken four years to break down the rebellion. With the Knights of the Golden Circle in the West, and the anti-draft rioters in the East, and the thousands of "copperheads" all through the North, the "left wing of Lee's army" was a greater menace to the success of the Union arms than all the Union men south of Mason and Dixon's line were to the South.

It has become fashionable with a certain class of writers of the North to belittle the achievements of their own section during the war. Some are those men who, in search of that political purity which will better agree with their delicate organisms, have left the party of Grant, Garfield, and Logan, and, having sought new affiliations in the company of those whom for years they have denounced as traitors, are now seeking to justify themselves by discovering heretofore unseen merits in their new friends, and similarly unknown faults in their old ones. Then we have the generals who went to the rear during the war. According to these gentry Grant was always doing the wrong thing, Sherman was a "crank" and a falsifier, and Sheridan a mere accident, while all the truly great generals who could have won battles upon strictly military lines were in retirement.

We might take counsel of the South in this respect. Admitting, as do most of the men of that section, that secession was an error, and vying with the North in their present devotion to the old flag, they love and honor their leaders, and revere the memory of Lee, Jackson, and Hood. They look back with pardonable pride upon the military prowess of the South, while it is left for the pessimists of the North to discredit their own people, and to belittle the services of their great leaders, and of the rank and file, who achieved the results that saved a nation.

A. P. MOREY.

V.

MR. CONWAY'S DRESS-COAT KING.

I MAY misapprehend the object, fail to follow the reasoning, and entirely miss the deduction of the contributor of the article entitled "Our King in Dress Coat" in your current number—probably I do—but having read it twice, it has brought me to a higher and more patriotic appreciation of the simplicity and perpetuity of American institutions than I heretofore possessed, and in proportion to that

improvement of my education am I indebted to the author. His language, together with a thoughtful retrospect of my personal experience and my reading, saves me from the abyss of despondency into which he seeks to plunge any man who had been careless enough to believe that the American Constitution for more than a century has proved good enough to live and prosper under in times of peace, or to fight under and win everlasting and indispensable victories in times of war. Never before have I felt such veneration for the "framers." Think of it! What have we escaped? Briefly stated, your contributor furnishes us with this category: At a reception given by President Andrew Jackson, "there was ice-cream, and I saw a number of people breathing over their spoons in order to melt it before putting it into their mouths"—Horrible! And yet the American Constitution survived, though the constitutions of the guests may have suffered.

Again, President Andrew Johnson was "a drunken ruffian who staggered about the country vomiting vilest abuse on the people and Congress." Yet when the debauch was over, somebody else took up the Constitution just where he had left it. Shocking, indeed, is it, according to your contributor, that it should be an element of success in a presidential campaign that one of the candidates "lived in a log cabin, or split rails, or traveled a tow path;" though hardly as shocking as the parallel with which he cynically follows it in the next line, "Was not the Son of God a carpenter, born in a stable?" Does he forget that the simple minded boys of the log cabin, these rail splitters, these mule drivers, shone at the bar, graduated at universities, and were giants in debate?

Lamenting the bad taste of the people in selecting military in preference to civilian presidents, he concedes that "one statesman *was* indeed elected, but could not take his seat against two generals in possession." This, of course, refers to that able and eminent American, Samuel J. Tilden, who was statesman enough to concede the right of Congress, under the Constitution, to appoint an impartial tribunal to count the vote upon an extraordinary occasion, but who was never coward enough to confess that "he could not take his seat against two generals in possession."

If, as stated by your contributor, John Stuart Mill displayed his ignorance of the literature of the age by expressing wonder "that among Americans there had been developed no school of critics and reformers of the Constitution," I hope it may *continue* to be a subject of wonder, rather than that critics should write simply to see themselves in print, and write nothing but "words." When any fair criticism of the American Constitution is produced by your contributor, I trust he will keep before him the definition of Lord Bolingbroke, that "the Constitution is the rule by which the sovereign *ought* to govern at all times; and government is that by which he *does* govern at any particular time;" while he looks back a hundred years for an instance of a willful and unquestioned violation of the American Constitution by the President; and when he approaches the subject of "The Executive" let him forget and regret that he ever wrote that "the phenomenon of an American potentate, stronger and less responsible than any other monarch in the world, has often been remarked, but not explained," and instead thereof let him find room in his memory for the many rebukes administered by the people, the Congress, and the Judiciary, in all cases of alleged unlawful exercise of power by the President, all of which has been accomplished under and by virtue of "The American Constitution."

Respectfully,

CHARLES H. T. COLLIS.